

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 were pending in the application. Claims 2-14, 17-18, 20-24, 26-27, 29-46 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 15, 16, 19, 25, 28 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of each of the pending claims.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor.

Claims 3 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32, and further in view of Tse.

Claims 4, 6, 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32, and further in view of Ritter.

Claims 9 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32, and further in view of He.

Claims 10 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32, and further in view of Shanbhag.

Claims 12, 14, 16-18, 22, 24, 26-28, 40, 42 and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 19-21, 29-30 and 32, and further in view of Bi.

Claims 13, 15, 23, 25, 41 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Thomas and further in view of Avidor and further in view of

Bi as applied to claims 12, 14, 16-18, 22, 24, 26-28, 40, 42 and 44-46, and further in view of Engelbrecht.

With regard to the amended claims, they have been amended to include elements for specifically detecting a location of a wireless terminal using specific technologies so that the channel blocks can be assigned to the segregated geographical segments in which the wireless terminal is in with predetermined priorities. The Examiner has conceded that Wang and Thomas do not teach how to detect a location of a wireless terminal, while Bi has some teachings in this technology area. In fact, Bi only teaches generally about detecting the location of a wireless terminal, but fails to teach any specific methods as claimed. For example, Bi does not teach that the detection is done by utilizing one or more segregated access code channels (ACCs) for the segregated geographical segments of the first wireless communication coverage unit to identify the wireless terminal wherein the ACCs and the segments bear a one-to-one relationship. Similarly, Bi fails to teach that the detection is done by using a path loss between a base station transceiver and the terminal for identifying a location of the terminal entering the wireless communication coverage unit. As such, Wang, Thomas, and Bi, individually or in combination, fail to teach the claimed invention, and the currently amended claims are believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this application in an allowable form. In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are drawn to novel subject matter, patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. The Examiner is therefore, respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Should the Examiner deem that any further clarification is desirable, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Howard Chen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,615

Duane Morris LLP
One Market Street
Spear Tower, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-1104
Telephone: (415) 371-2200
Facsimile: (415) 371-2201